| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/016,982 | 12/14/2001 | Vincent Auffray | FR920000065US1 | 4957 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 45092 7590 04/26/2006 | | |

HOFFMAN, WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO LLC
75 STATE ST
14TH FL
ALBANY, NY 12207

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| BASHORE, WILLIAM L |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2176 | |

DATE MAILED: 04/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 February 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.      2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/6/2006</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      This action is responsive to communications: RCE and amendment filed 2/23/2006, to the original

application filed 12/14/2001, with foreign priority filing date of **12/20/2000**. IDS filed 10/24/2005, and

2/6/2006.

2.      Regarding IDS filed 2/6/2006, the International Search Report cannot be considered, because a search

report by itself is not considered prior art.

3.      Claims 1-12 pending. Claim 1 is independent.

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

4.      A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e),

was filed in this application after final rejection.  Since this application is eligible for continued examination

under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous

Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.  Applicant's submission filed on 2/23/2006 has

been entered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set

forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102
> of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the
> art to which said subject matter pertains.  Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

6.        **Claims 1-3, 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Kikinis (hereinafter**

**Kikinis), U.S. Patent No, 5,794,259 issued August 1, 1998, in view of Ashlin Weekly Update (hereinafter**

**Ashlin Weekly), April 3, 1999, downloaded from <http://www.ashlin.ca/news/HTM/19990403.htm>, pages**

**1-2.**

        **In regard to independent claim 1**, Kikinis discloses filling in data on a displayed HTML form fetched

from the Internet (Kikinin Abstract, column 2 lines 1-20, Figure 2).

        Kikinis discloses control code in the form of a TSR program, or a plug-in module (typically

downloaded) to a Web browser (a program component) (Kikinis column 3 lines 47-56).

        Kikinis discloses that the plug-in is utilized for creation of bubble menus providing data to be filled in,

said data pre-stored on a computer (typically contained in memory, i.e. hard drive, buffer memory, etc.). Data is

then filled in the HTML form accordingly (Kikinis Figure 2, column 3 lines 35-36, 45-55, 59-63, column 4 lines

8-25).

        Kikinis does not specifically teach downloading said data from a server if said data is not already on the

client, using said data for filling in said HTML form accordingly. However, Ashlin Weekly teaches Digitalme,

comprising a proxy server which intercepts an Internet form, automatically filling in said form, and providing

(downloading) the completed form for review (Ashlin Weekly page 1, third paragraph from top, compare with

claim 1 *"upon determination (51) that said requested information data is not stored in the buffer memory*

*allocated to the program component in the network client, the program component obtaining (57) the requested*

*data by downloading the requested data from the network server and filling (59) the dedicated form fields in the*

*hypertext document with the downloaded information data"*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Ashlin Weekly to Kikinis, allowing a user of Kikinis the

capability of storing fill-in data (i.e. sensitive data) off of a client computer, and on a server instead, increasing

the security and "privacy awareness" of a user's information.

**In regard to dependent claim 2**, Kikinis discloses a user perusing a form for accuracy, to which

corrections can be made prior to uploading the completed HTML form to its destination (i.e. a server) (Kikinis

column 2 lines 19-21, column 4 lines 5-9, also Figure 2 especially item 209).

**In regard to dependent claim 3**, Kikinis does not specifically teach user authentication prior to display

of an HTML form document. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify Kikinis to do this, since Kikinis teaches encryption and password protected access for

user profiles (Kikinis column 4 lines 32-37), providing reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan to extend

user security for entering secure sites, providing the benefit of added security to sensitive Web sites (i.e. banking

sites, etc.)

**In regard to dependent claim 9**, Kikinis discloses filling in forms on the Internet, said forms

comprising Web forms (Kikinis column 3 lines 15-30, 32-33). It is well established that Web pages on the

Internet utilize the HTTP protocol (i.e. <http://www.uspto.gov>, etc.).

**In regard to dependent claims 10-12**, claims 10-12 reflect the computer system, program, and

computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as

claimed in claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale.

7.       **Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis and Ashlin**

**Weekly as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bhatia et al. (hereinafter Bhatia), U.S.**

**Publication No. 2002/0154162 published October 24, 2002.**

**In regard to dependent claim 4**, Kikinis does not specifically teach scripting (script program). However, Bhatia teaches form fill in utilizing JavaScript (Bhatia paragraphs 0057, 0088). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bhatia to Kikinis, providing Kikinis the benefit of JavaScript for increased platform independence.

**In regard to dependent claims 5-8**, Kikinis teaches categories of information (an identification list) (Kikinis Figure 2).

Kikinis does not specifically teach frames. However, Bhatia teaches HTML forms with frames (Bhatia paragraph 0076). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bhatia to Kikinis, providing Kikinis the benefit of frames for a more pleasing visual appearance.

Bhatia teaches form fill in utilizing JavaScript (i.e. applets, etc.) (Bhatia paragraphs 0057, 0088). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bhatia to Kikinis, providing Kikinis the benefit of JavaScript for increased platform independence.

*Response to Arguments*

8.      Applicant's arguments filed 2/23/2006 have been fully and carefully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues on page 8 of the amendment that Kikinis does not teach allocating a buffer memory to the control code, and determining whether data is stored within said buffer, etc.

It is respectfully noted that Kikinis's teaching of activation of a Hot Key for invoking a control component teaches a user requesting information through a user interface for obtaining user information (data) for form filling (Kikinis column 3 lines 58-67). Kikinis's data is also pre-stored (Kikinis column 4 lines 8-11).

The examiner respectfully maintains that memory buffers for holding data is well established in the relevant arts. As per representative claim 1, a user determines that the needed data is prestored (i.e. in RAM

memory, etc.), therefore said data is retrieved from buffer memory accordingly. Since a buffer is generally a

memory for temporary data storage, it is at least obvious that buffers are used (i.e. RAM, page files, etc.) for

holding data for quick access.

*Conclusion*

9.      Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be

reached on 11:30am - 8:00pm EST.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather

Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application

or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10.     Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-

9197 (toll-free).

**WILLIAM BASHORE**
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

April 24, 2006